1	Paul A. Stewart (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
2	paul.stewart@kmob.com Irfan A. Lateef (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
2	irfan.lateef@kmob.com	
3	Cheryl T. Burgess (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) cheryl.burgess@kmob.com	
4	KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP 2040 Main Street, 14th Floor	
5	2040 Main Street, 14 th Floor Irvine, CA 92614	
5	Telephone: (949) 760-0404	
6	Facsimile: (949) 760-9502	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant	
	William H. Boice (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
8	bboice@kilpatricktownsend.com Steven D. Moore (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
9	smoore@kilpatricktownsend.com	
	Kristopher L. Reed (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
10	kreed@kilpatricktownsend.com Matthew M. Lubozynski (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
11	mlubozynski@kilpatricktownsend.com	
10	Christopher Schenck (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
12	cschenck@kilpatricktownsend.com KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP	
13	1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800	
14	Atlanta, GA 30309-4528	
14	Telephone: (404) 815-6500 Facsimile: (404) 815-6555	
15	Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimants	
16	IN THE UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
17	2-WAY COMPUTING, INC., a Nevada	Case No.: 2:11-cv-00012-JCM-(PAL)
18	corporation,	Case 110 2.11 ev 00012 veivi (1112)
10	Disinsiff	
19	Plaintiff,	
20	v.	
21	SPRINT SOLUTIONS, INC., a Delaware	
	corporation; NEXTEL FINANCE	ORDER GRANTING
22	COMPANY, a Delaware corporation;	CONSENT MOTION FOR
23	SPRINT UNITED MANAGEMENT COMPANY, a Kansas corporation;	CLARIFICATION OF ORDERS ON
	NEXTEL OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a	MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY
24	Delaware corporation; NEXTEL BOOST OF CALIFORNIA, LLC, a Delaware limited	JUDGMENT
25	liability company, and NEXTEL	
26	COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a Delaware	
26	corporation,	
27	Defendants.	
28	AND DELATED GOVERNO CLARA	
ں ے	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM	

ON THIS DAY the Court considered the parties' Consent Motion for Clarification of Orders on Motions for Summary Judgment, and having fully considered the joint motion, the Court hereby orders as follows:

- It is ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that the parties' Consent
 Motion for Clarification of Orders on Motions for Summary Judgment is hereby GRANTED.
 The Court clarifies its prior Orders (Doc. Nos. 160 and 161) as follows:
 - a. For the reasons set forth in the Court's Order on the Motion for Summary Judgment of Noninfringement (Doc. #160), the Court holds that none of the accused QChat devices infringes any claim of United States Patent No. 5,434,797, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.
 - b. For the reasons set forth in the Court's Order on the Motion for Summary Judgment as to the Applicability of Intervening Rights (Doc. #161), the Court holds that Plaintiff's claim of infringement of claim 6 of United States Patent No. 5,434,797 is not impacted by the Court's holding regarding absolute intervening rights.

DATED July 15, 2014.

THE HONORABLE JAMES C. MAHAN